

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The examiner points out that the claims do not recite two second bolts and the invention is not disclosed as being able to function without these elements. However, the two second bolts are recited on lines 5-6 in claim 1 for sure. Nevertheless, applicant amends claim 1 to replace the term “threaded” with -- threadedly – on line 6 of claim 1 to correct the grammatical error. Besides, claim 2 is cancelled for duplication to the claim 1.


Furthermore, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The examiner points out that “the two second bolts” in claim 4, line 5 lacks proper antecedent basis. Since the two second bolts are cited in the claim 1 for sure, the rejection to claim 4 should be eliminated.

Applicant thanks to the examiner who points out that the claimed invention is allowable and the amended claim 1 makes the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior arts cited by the Examiner. It is believed that, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be removed, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted the amended claims 3 and 4 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


TENG-FU CHEN